

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usntp.gov

	www.uspto.gov	
	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
_		

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/753,764 12/29/2000 Sailesh Kottapalli 2207/10122 3475 7590 **EXAMINER** 10/06/2004 Kenyon & Kenyon HUISMAN, DAVID J Suite 600 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 333 W. San Carlos Street San Jose, CA 95110-2711 2183

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/753,764	KOTTAPALLI, SAIL	ESH		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David J. Huisman	2183			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) \(they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: see attached sheet (part A).					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet (part B).					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22, as set forth in the final reject</u>	ion.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.⊠ The drawing correction filed on 23 September 200	$\frac{14}{2}$ is a)⊠ approved or b)□ di	sapproved by the E	xaminer.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
_					

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

- (A) Applicant has failed to overcome the 35 USC 112 rejection of the independent claims. More specifically, in using the language "the storage element coupled to the associated multiplexer", it is still not clear whether applicant is delivering inactive thread pointers to the first, second, or both storage elements. The examiner suggests specifically associating the first and second storage elements with active and inactive threads.
- (B) Applicant argues on page 10 of the remarks, in substance that:

"AAPA does not teach or suggest a first storage element coupled to an output of the first multiplexer and a second storage element coupled to an output of the second multiplexer, as claimed in claims 1, 10, and 19 as amended."

Although this argument has been fully considered by the examiner, it has been found non-persuasive because the storage elements of AAPA are coupled to both the inputs and outputs of the multiplexers. For instance, looking at Fig.2 of AAPA, storage element 248 provides a pointer as an input to a first multiplexer 218. Consequently, storage element 248 is couple dto the input of the first multiplexer. In addition, storage element 248 also receives an instruction pointer, from logic 232. However, the pointer received by element 248 via logic 232 originated from multiplexer 218 (assuming multiplexer 218 was doing the outputting). Consequently, storage element 248 is coupled to the output of the first multiplexer. As a result, the examiner asserts that AAPA still reads on applicant's claims as presently worded.

(C) Finally, as a side note, there is an informality in Fig.4. Applicant should label the "No" path of decisional block 236 with an --N--, as is done in decisional block 440.

EDDIE CHAN

Eslie cl

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100